

**To:** Hosch, Claudia[hosch.claudia@epa.gov]  
**Cc:** Gaines, Arlene[Gaines.Arlene@epa.gov]  
**From:** Jones, Curry  
**Sent:** Mon 8/17/2015 4:18:36 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Draft comments 8/16/2015-for DWB criteria

No. There is there 106 monitoring initiative funds which is priority monitoring in special watersheds, and then their base 106 monitoring grant which covers monitoring staff and activities. What David's email did not say is if EPA was giving the state additional money that could be loaded on the NMED existing grant, or if we are talking about changing NMED existing scope.

Curry

---

Curry Jones, MPH

Chief, State and Tribal Section (6WQ-AT)  
US Environmental Protection Agency - Region 6  
Phone: (214)665-6793  
Fax: (214)665-2191  
Email: jones.curry@epa.gov

### Follow EPA Region 6



**From:** Hosch, Claudia  
**Sent:** Monday, August 17, 2015 11:13 AM  
**To:** Jones, Curry  
**Cc:** Gaines, Arlene  
**Subject:** RE: Draft comments 8/16/2015-for DWB criteria

Is there a separate 106 monitoring like you have in other states?

Claudia V. Hosch

Associate Director

Water Quality Protection Division

Assistance Programs Branch

EPA Region 6, Dallas, TX

214 665 6464



**From:** Jones, Curry

**Sent:** Monday, August 17, 2015 11:06 AM

**To:** Hosch, Claudia

**Cc:** Gaines, Arlene

**Subject:** FW: Draft comments 8/16/2015-for DWB criteria

Claudia,

NMED has an existing CWA 106 grant that would be best suited for both stream bottom deposits and river water quality. Are we talking about adding new money to this existing grant, or are we talk about allowing the state to change the scope. Most of the workplan covers staff salaries.

Curry

---

Curry Jones, MPH

Chief, State and Tribal Section (6WQ-AT)  
US Environmental Protection Agency - Region 6  
Phone: (214)665-6793  
Fax: (214)665-2191  
Email: [jones.curry@epa.gov](mailto:jones.curry@epa.gov)

### Follow EPA Region 6



**From:** Garcia, David

**Sent:** Monday, August 17, 2015 10:52 AM

**To:** Hosch, Claudia

**Cc:** Honker, William; Rawls, Maurice; Jones, Curry; Crossland, Ronnie; Edlund, Carl

**Subject:** FW: Draft comments 8/16/2015-for DWB criteria

Claudia,

Please read Ronnie's email below. Are there existing NMED grant mechanisms that can be used for support of long term monitoring:

-

•■■■■■■■■ **River Condition:** Routine stream sampling with the same analytes should continue by the EPA in order to monitor water quality changes with stream flow changes.

- **□□□□□□□□ Aquifer Condition:** EPA should continue with follow up monitoring of the same analytes in the source water for potentially impacted public groundwater wells after typical pumping has occurred.

- **□□□□□□□□ Long term Sediment Impacts:** The impacts of processing and treating source water with such increased levels of contaminated sediment are unknown. DWB would want confirmation from EPA that they would continue to monitor sediment quality and assume responsibility for any future damages/repairs to treatment facilities that may result from the contaminated sediment.

David F. Garcia

Deputy Director

Water Quality

Protection Division

U.S. EPA Region 6

1445 Ross Avenue (Mail Code: 6WQ-D)

Dallas, Texas 75202-2733

Phone: (214) 665-7593

**Follow EPA Region 6**



**From:** Edlund, Carl  
**Sent:** Monday, August 17, 2015 10:35 AM  
**To:** Crossland, Ronnie  
**Cc:** Webster, Susan; Petersen, Chris; Bernier, Roberto; Garcia, David; Restivo, Angela  
**Subject:** Re: Draft comments 8/16/2015-for DWB criteria

Is it possible to separate short term (2 weeks or less) from long term (2 weeks +)? actions.

Sediment: If we did TCLP on sediment samples that we have already and find that it passes, wouldn't that resolve future concerns from storm events? Seems to me that future release events from Gold King or other sites would be a whole new thing and outside of this agreement.

Drinking water: in the next 2 weeks we should get results from the short holding time systems (Morningstar, others), if they test safe, wouldn't that mean that longer retention systems would test even safer? I do understand that NMED wants EPA to be accountable. What actions would be needed if the systems have Gold King contaminants.

Regarding warning systems: I can see that NM was embarrassed by lack of communication regarding the surge (so were we) and wants something to prevent that in the future. Not sure USGS/ river warning system would solve what is a communication problem. Would an intergovernmental agreement between NM, R-6, and R-8 on emergency communication be better?

Do we have a compilation of different funding mechanisms in place already that might be used for future actions? 106 grant, SDW grants, cooperative agreements with different stakeholders? We could invent new ones but existing would be better.

Does this help?

Sent from my iPad

On Aug 17, 2015, at 8:23 AM, Crossland, Ronnie <[Crossland.Ronnie@epa.gov](mailto:Crossland.Ronnie@epa.gov)> wrote:

Carl,

I agree that the 100 day timeframe seems like a long time. However, the biggest issue is associated with the sediment basins. It appears that NMED wants EPA to take responsibility for the disposal of all sediment from DW Systems for the foreseeable future. Both total and dissolved sample results indicate low levels of metals. In addition, NMED wants EPA to install some type of river warning system to warn operators of either storm events that might stir up sediment or in the event another mine has a release. We have sampled the sediment and it below screening levels. Monitoring for future events is outside the scope of this response. These issues need to be resolved at a higher level.

Ronnie

**From:** Edlund, Carl

**Sent:** Monday, August 17, 2015 8:41 AM

**To:** Webster, Susan

**Cc:** Petersen, Chris; Bernier, Roberto; Crossland, Ronnie

**Subject:** Re: Draft comments 8/16/2015-for DWB criteria

Thanks...largely good but I have a few questions: Short term seems pretty long (up to 100 days for water to go thru the system); we should be well past immediate Removal Action.

Wouldn't this be part of long term response? Payment through a grant (Water grant to NMED?).

Sent from my iPad

On Aug 16, 2015, at 7:37 PM, Webster, Susan <[webster.susan@epa.gov](mailto:webster.susan@epa.gov)> wrote:

Draft tonight.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Restivo, Angela" <[Restivo.Angela@epa.gov](mailto:Restivo.Angela@epa.gov)>  
**Date:** August 16, 2015 at 8:23:24 PM CDT  
**To:** "Garcia, David" <[Garcia.David@epa.gov](mailto:Garcia.David@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** "Webster, Susan" <[webster.susan@epa.gov](mailto:webster.susan@epa.gov)>, "Smith, Monica" <[smith.monica@epa.gov](mailto:smith.monica@epa.gov)>, "Foster, Althea" <[Foster.Althea@epa.gov](mailto:Foster.Althea@epa.gov)>, "Ngo, Kim" <[Ngo.Kim@epa.gov](mailto:Ngo.Kim@epa.gov)>, "Loston, Anthony" <[Loston.Anthony@epa.gov](mailto:Loston.Anthony@epa.gov)>, "Crossland, Ronnie" <[Crossland.Ronnie@epa.gov](mailto:Crossland.Ronnie@epa.gov)>, "McCasland, Mark" <[McCasland.Mark@epa.gov](mailto:McCasland.Mark@epa.gov)>, "Martin, John" <[martin.john@epa.gov](mailto:martin.john@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** Draft comments 8/16/2015-for DWB criteria

This is a draft version.

Angela Restivo

Compliance Officer

Drinking Water Section

U.S. EPA Region 6

1445 Ross Ave (6WQ-SD)

Dallas,Texas 75202-2733

phone: 214-665-7123

<Gold King Mine Spill All Clear Criteria Draft comments8162015.docx>